

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

NOV 14 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Applicant: DaCosta)	Art Unit: 2614
)	
Serial No.: 10/782,265)	Examiner: Beliveau
)	
Filed: February 19, 2004)	50T5776
)	
For: SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING)	November 6, 2005
CONTENT LIST IN RESPONSE TO SELECTED)	750 B STREET, Suite 3120
CLOSED CAPTION WORD)	San Diego, CA 92101
)	

RESPONSE TO ADVISORY ACTION

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

Dear Sir:

This RCE is submitted in response to the Advisory Action dated November 2, 2005 refusing to enter new Claim 27 and alleging that by adding it without pointing out its distinctions over the prior art, Applicant was being "non-responsive" to the rejections in the Office Action September 13, 2005. Applicant fully responded to the rejections of the prior claims, but since no rejections had been made against the new claim, there was nothing to respond to in that regard. Applicant believes that the record makes clear why new claim 27 is patentable, but in any event it is the examiner's initial burden to demonstrate why a new claim is unpatentable, not Applicant's burden to show *ab initio* the opposite.

Respectfully submitted,



John L. Rogitz
Registration No. 33,549
Attorney of Record
750 B Street, Suite 3120
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 338-8075

JLR:jg

1168-117.AM1